CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the Pacific
LIBRARY

THE ANGLICAN

A QUARTERLY NEWS-LETTER OF THE AMERICAN BRANCH OF THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

The objects of the American Branch of the Anglican Society are:

1. To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.

2. To uphold and appreciate the Anglican Use both in rite and ceremonial.

Membership is invited on the broad principle of loyalty to the American Prayer Book, Constitution and Canons and the Common Law of the Anglican Communion. Apply to either the Secretary or the Chairman of the Extension Committee for membership. The dues are $2.00 a year which includes subscription to "The Anglican."

SUMMER 1949

VOL. V, NO. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Marriage and Divorce Again. By The Editor 1

Orthodoxy and the Christian Tradition of Marriage and Divorce. By the Editor 4

Do the Four Freedoms Apply to Episcopalians in the Armed Forces? By the Editor 10

Proposed Resolution of General Convention Clarifying the Religious Rights and Privileges of Episcopalians in the Armed Forces. Suggested by a Chaplain 12

The Movement of the Liturgy (Concluded). By the Editor 13

THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY
at
GENERAL CONVENTION,
SAN FRANCISCO, 1949.

THE Corporate Communion of the Society will be celebrated at 8:00 A. M. on Wednesday, October 5th, in St. Francis Church, San Fernando Way at Ocean Avenue. Breakfast will be served in the Parish House immediately afterwards. Please make your breakfast reservation with the rector, The Rev. E. M. Pennell, Jr., St. Francis Church, San Fernando Way at Ocean Avenue, San Francisco 16, California. The church is reached by the "K" car on Market Street direct to the church corner, which is about 25 minutes ride. San Francisco has a maximum taxi fare of $1.50, which means that four persons could ride out together and the fare would not be excessive.

Be Sure to Visit The Anglican Society Booth in the Civic Auditorium.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE AGAIN

By the Editor.

ONCE more the drive is on to get the Church to water down our Lord's teaching on the subject of marriage and divorce. Once more an attempt is made to find a compromise between Galilee and Reno; to combine the standards of our Lord and those of the world. This time it arises from the Tentative Report of the Special Committee of three Bishops on Procedure Under Marriage Legislation, established by General Convention, 1946.

Some of the statements in the Report are dubious. Others are downright absurd. Among the latter is the statement that the Anglican Communion allows causes arising after marriage to dissolve the marriage bond, allows, that is to say, divorce with remarriage. It is difficult to see how two of the three Bishops who composed the Special Committee could make such an unfounded statement. The Church of England does not allow divorce in the sense of a separation permitting of remarriage, nor does the Anglican Communion as a whole. The Episcopal Church in this country has at times spoken with hesitating voice, but even then there has been no recognition of any general principle of divorce. The "innocent party" exception—resting on the now discredited gloss on our Lord's teaching in St. Matthew—was very definitely an *exception* to the general principle and law of the indissolubility of Christian matrimony. The Canon which permitted the remarriage of the "innocent party" from 1867 to 1946 was of doubtful constitutionality. It was passed by only one General Convention, whereas it should have been passed by two successive Conventions if it was to repeal the clear teaching of the marriage service, that marriage is indissoluble, and that if any two persons marry otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful. (Prayer Book, p. 300)

The Report of the Commission, however, says nothing about our Lord's teaching on holy matrimony; it misrepresents the teaching of the Anglican Communion as a whole; and it somehow or other conveys the impression that there are two rival traditions, one Eastern and one Western, of about equal standing on the subject of Christian marriage.

This is not the case. There was one tradition as to what our Lord taught for many centuries, and this tradition was accepted by the Eastern Churches no less than the Western. The unhappy compromises of the East came far too late to represent a rival and authentic tradition as to our Lord's teaching in the matter. No more need be said on this point as there is an article on this subject in the present issue of "The Anglican".

Our Lord's teaching on the subject of marriage and divorce is a "hard saying" today, no less than at the time he uttered it. It was meant to be. Moses for "the hardness of men's hearts" made concessions—the old law compromised with the eternal purpose of God. Under the new dispensation, however, there is to be no swerving from God's intention, no dilution of the divine principle, but the gift of power from on high, the Holy Spirit, to enable men to do what to merely human strength would be impossible. Marriage of one man and one woman for life in an indissoluble union is the teaching of Christ and his Church. We have no desire to enforce our Lord's standards on the un-Christian world about us—on the multitudes outside the Church—but for the Church's children endued with sacramental grace there can be no compromise without spiritual suicide—and social suicide as well.

But, it is urged, our Lord was only intent on setting up an ideal, a principle—he was not laying down a hard and fast law. This is a very plausible objection, but it is in reality sophistical. Our Lord is drawn out as to whether he sides with the strict school of Shammai—which permitted divorce only for unchastity—or with the lax school of Hillel (and certain groups in the Episcopal Church), allowing divorce for almost everything which the dull conscience of the day permitted. He sweeps aside both of these solutions (unless we accept the discredited Matthean gloss), and carries us back to the eternal purpose and will of God which are from now on to be the standard of his disciples.

"Henceforth they are no more twain, but one flesh," that is the principle. "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder"—that is the rule. The most slippery sophist cannot escape it. On this point, at least, principle and rule are inseparably conjoined; the rule here is the incarnation of the principle and the corollary follows inevitably from both, and Incarnate God himself utters it: "whosoever therefore shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery." Now

the avoidance of adultery is not for the Christian an "ideal"—as monasticism might be held to be the ideal—but an elementary and universal commandment.

But how about the hard cases—how about those who "suffer in an intolerable situation"? Our heart is wrung by many such cases and situations. But the situation has been made, and the question is who is to suffer for it—the individuals who made the situation or society as a whole. For Christians, there can be no hesitation as to the answer. Practically, as well as logically, there is no stopping place between monogamous, indissoluble marriage, and a thinly disguised free love. As Keyserling remarks: "adultery, for all its viciousness, went on for centuries without wrecking marriage, while half a century of divorce has brought the institution to the very verge of extinction." Always someone must suffer from the break-up of the home,—children, if there are any, in all cases society. And monogamous marriage is so vital to a decent—not to say a Christian—society, that it must be preserved, even at the cost of individual suffering. Surely for those whose emblem is the cross, there can be no doubt of that. "My grace is sufficient for thee" is the Christian's assurance in all his suffering, through the grace of the Crucified, which will never fail him. The one thing which he cannot endure is to lower his Master's standards, for himself and for society, in the interests of his own comfort. Much less will he seek the Church's blessing in so doing. "After all, there is not a case of hard *versus* easy, but of right *versus* wrong."

The endeavor to bless what God hath not blessed, to say to the sinner "go, and sin some more," may win the plaudits of the world, it may gain us the reputation of being liberal-minded, if not clear-headed. It will scarcely serve either to strengthen the faltering or to win to the cause of Christ those who are attracted by high principles and stern demands, not by weak concessions and thinly-veiled surrenders. Masses of men of all denominations or none are looking for a Church which is not of this world and whose standards are not of this world; which conceives herself to be sent to teach all nations,—not to put her ear to the ground, and then proclaim to them what they want to hear. What a pity if they should pass right by our door in justified contempt, and think to find in another great Communion what we ourselves lack. "Prophesy not unto us true things, but prophesy smooth things," is the demand of the world today as it was in the days of Isaiah. But it is not the demand of those worth winning, and it is not the demand of the Son of God.

ORTHODOXY AND THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

By the Editor

LIBERAL Anglican Bishops are discovering Orthodoxy. Not the liturgical, theological and devotional treasures of Orthodoxy; not the Orthodox insistence on the acceptance of the entire Catholic faith as a pre-condition to reunion and even intercommunion. Not the emphasis on the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the seven Sacraments or Apostolic Succession or the glories of the most Holy Mother of Our Lord. Nothing of that sort. But they are discovering Eastern Orthodoxy at its weakest point—the compromises in practice, and sometimes in theory, which serve to deny or obscure our Lord's teaching on the absolute indissolubility of Holy Matrimony. They have discovered Orthodox canonists who teach that marriage is dissolved only by death, but who treat adultery and several other causes as equivalent to moral or spiritual death. Some Anglican Bishops have even concluded that these Orthodox have preserved the true tradition of our Lord's teaching. Thus the Bishop of Rochester, England, writes: "Personally, I am inclined to believe that the Orthodox Church has preserved all down the ages of Christendom the true Christian tradition; and that a study of the conception of the death of marriage is long overdue." (*Five Questions before the Church*—P. 36.)

No patristic scholar of any standing would agree with the Bishop in this matter. The ante-Nicene Fathers are perfectly clear as to the indissolubility of holy matrimony, and no suggestion that divorce with remarriage is legitimate comes from them. Not a word is said by them as to any metaphorical "death" dissolving the marriage. They are absolutely loyal to the clear teaching of our Lord that marriage is indissoluble. They do not interpret even the "exceptive clause" of Matthew as permitting remarriage after divorce.

The opinion of the Bishop of Rochester is shared by some of our own American Bishops. Perhaps something of the sort underlies the language of the "Proposals to Clarify the Marriage Canons", (The report of the Special Committee of the House of Bishops), which has just appeared. "It is well known that in two other branches of the Catholic Church, the one holds that only when causes have existed before marriage, which

make the marriage null and void, can a second marriage be solemnized; the other, that certain causes arising after marriage may dissolve the marriage bond."

It must be emphasized that the lax practice of the Eastern Churches since the fifth century has colored their theory, instead of the theory governing the practice. The Eastern Fathers of the first three or four centuries are in agreement with the Western Fathers of the same period, that marriage is absolutely indissoluble. That is to say, that there can be no remarriage after a divorce, even when granted for adultery. St. Asterius of Pontus, in the fifth century, is, I believe, the first Eastern Father who definitely recedes from this position. St. Basil has sometimes been quoted to the same effect, but his testimony is ambiguous.

Inasmuch as this vital question is very much to the fore at the present time, a brief survey of Orthodox teaching and practice in regard to the marriage and divorce question seems advisable.

The indissolubility of Christian marriage is generally taught by the Orthodox in their treatises on Dogmatic Theology and in their catechisms.[1] Some conceive this indissolubility to be absolute, e. g. Meletios Syrigus (17th century). Generally, however, theologians allow one ground of divorce, namely adultery.[2] In so teaching, they appeal, of course, to the exceptive clause in St. Matthew (V, 32 and XIX, 9). Sylvester Lebidinsky (1805) and Macarios Bulgakoff are among those who teach this. Others like Malinovsky admit that divorce is permitted by the Eastern Church *for grave causes* to avoid worse evils. Androutsos (*Dogmatike*, p. 400) and Dyovouniotes (*Ta Mysteria*—pp. 180-181) attack the Roman practise of "separation from bed and board," as unknown in antiquity, although the practise is not unknown in some of the Eastern Churches today (among the Serbs and the Greeks and in the Patriarchate of Constantinople.)

While the theologians in general permit at most one ground for absolute divorce, the canonists go on to allow it for many others. Nor is this a recent innovation. After the Empire had become nominally Christian, a great relaxation in the austerity of Christian morality is evident, not least in the sphere of the ethics of marriage, and sad compromises with current practise are seen in both West and East, particularly in the latter. At first adultery alone is conceived as breaking the otherwise in-

(1) Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium*, III, 459. The writer desires to express his indebtedness to Fr. Jugie's great work.

(2) E. g. Androutsos, *Dogmatike*, p. 399 f., Dyovouniotes, *Ta Mysteria*, p. 178 f. Among the Russians, Khomyakoff, *Collected Works* (in Russian, Moscow, 1906) Vol. II, pp. 137-139.

dissoluble marriage bond. St. Asterius (before mentioned) and some other Eastern theologians take this point of view. But once a hole is made in the dikes, the trickle swells to a flood. The inevitable question crops up, "Are not other sins against marriage as grave as unfaithfulness? If a divorce, with the possibility of remarriage, may be granted on this ground, why not on others?" The lax influence of the corrupt Court of Constantinople must be taken into account in this whole matter.

Justinian's reign marks an epoch. This great Emperor, though abolishing divorce by consent and otherwise restricting the laxity which was a heritage from paganism, nevertheless made many concessions to the low moral standards of the time. His 117th Novel came at length to be incorporated into the *Nomocanon* of the Eastern Church in the tenth century. (Milash). The 117th Novel of Justinian allows divorce for nine causes:

1. Failure to reveal a conspiracy against the Emperor.
2. Adultery of the wife (not of the husband!) when judicially proved.
3. A plot of the husband against his wife's chastity, (that is an attempt to make her comit adultery).
4. A plot by either partner against the life of the other, or failure to reveal such a plot.
5. A meal or bath taken by the wife with strangers apart from the knowledge and wish of the husband.
6. A false charge of adultery brought by the husband against the wife.
7. The case of the wife remaining out, apart from the knowledge and consent of her husband,—unless under her parents' roof,—or frequenting the theatre, the hippodrome, etc.
8. The introduction of a concubine into the house by the husband, or his living with her openly in the same city, after being twice warned by his wife's parents or others.
9. The continued captivity of either partner among the enemy.

These nine causes were received by the Eastern Church from the tenth century until the fall of the Roman Empire in 1453 (cf Jugie III, 461). It should be noted in passing that for nearly two centuries of this period, the Byzantine Church was in Communion with Rome and the West, and no official protest was launched against its laxity. This is perhaps less

surprising when we remember the laxity of large parts of the West. (cf *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms, *c.* 1020? cf also the *Penitentiale* of Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, which had great influence in parts of the West, particularly in the Frankish Church).

One would suppose that the Code of Justinian, with its nine grounds of divorce, was sufficiently "liberal" for any professing Christian whatever. Not so. Other causes of divorce came to be admitted in the later Byzantine period. Among these are the following:

1. Defloration of the bride before marriage.
2. Sodomy on the part of the man.
3. Hatred of the wife for the husband on account of injuries or indignities received at his hands; hatred of the husband for his wife on account of physical defects wilfully concealed before the marriage; or unconquerable mutual aversion, springing from the suspicion of infidelity or other causes, making cohabitation intolerable and dangerous.
4. An abortion procured by the wife out of hatred for her husband.
5. The absence of either spouse without tidings for five years.
6. The entrance of either partner into the religious life.
7. Insanity of the husband for three years; insanity of the wife for five years.
8. Spiritual affinity arising from the reception of one's own child from the font at baptism. [The Eastern Orthodox mother does not attend the christening today].
9. Disparity of cult or difference of religion arising *after* the marriage. [This provision was even more sweeping than that which Pope Celestine III introduced into the West in the late twelfth century, since the latter dealt apparently with complete apostacy from the Christian religion, while the Byzantine provision envisages heresy also as a ground for divorce.]

After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 and the collapse of the Roman Empire, other causes of divorce came to be allowed in some parts of the Eastern Church on the ground of custom or "Economy".

1. Any especially grave disease of body or mind (e. g. paralysis, blindness, etc.).
2. Grave incompatibility of character (very seldom allowed).
3. Mutual consent, in at least one case (CP 1877).
4. Desertion for at least three years.
5. Crime committed by either partner, or sentence of penal servitude.

Up to the time of Peter the Great, the Byzantine grounds for divorce were accepted in the Russian Church. Other causes crept in, however. The Synod of Moscow in 1918 recognized the following grounds:

1. Impotence existing at the time of the marriage.
2. Apostacy from the Orthodox Faith.
3. Adultery or unnatural sins, etc.
4. Voluntary mutilation rendering one incapable of the marriage relation.
5. Leprosy.
6. Syphilis.
7. Three years absence without tidings.
8. Condemnation to punishment involving loss of previous condition and forfeiture of civil rights.
9. Plots against the life of spouse or children; likewise grave injuries, wounds, etc. inflicted upon spouse or children; to which were subsequently added dangerous insecurity, rendering married life perilous or impossible, and malicious desertion.

Formerly the marriage of the guilty party was strictly forbidden. It is now permitted after the lapse of a certain fixed time and completion of canonical penance. (Heiler *Urkirche und Ostkirche*, p. 282 n.)

A divorce is not recognized unless it is granted by an ecclesiastical court. Civil divorce as such is not accepted.

It should be noted that the canonists of the Eastern Churches are as a rule much laxer than the theologians. Kallinikos, for example, in his *"Greek Orthodox Catechism"* (tr. London, 1926) speaks of marriage as "an indissoluble union" (though later he says "it is dissolved by adultery!"). At a conference at Karlovtsky in 1927, eleven Russian emigré Bishops declared marriage indissoluble except by death. It is moreover

important to notice that Orthodox canon law retains traces of the original Christian tradition that the marriage bond is absolutely indissoluble. Thus Canon 48 "of the Apostles" reads: "If a layman, casting out his wife, take another, or one that is put away by another, let him stand excommunicate." Some of the canons of the Councils of Carthage to the same effect have likewise retained their place in the Orthodox collection of canons.

The laxity of Orthodox practise is deplored by many members of that Church, including at least one outstanding canonist of the writer's acquaintance. Orthodox laxity in this matter contrasts sharply with its general fidelity to Christian faith and morals. On the whole no Church in Christendom has been so faithful a witness to the ancient Apostolic and Catholic Faith as the Orthodox. But its record in the matter of marriage and divorce is an unhappy exception, and constitutes, as Heiler says, "ein dunkler Punkt im Leben der Orthodoxen Kirche." (op. cit. p. 282.)

On thing is manifest. It has not the slightest claim to represent the original Christian tradition as to the teaching of our Lord on the question of marriage and divorce. That teaching stands out crystal clear in the pages of the New Testament (barring the Matthian "gloss", which practically all modern scholars throw out as representing the teaching of Christ) and in the unanimous teaching of the Church of the first three centuries, to which the Anglican Church rightly appealed at the Reformation and since. Nothing as yet has appeared which makes plausible any attempt to deny or explain away the plain words of our Lord; "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery. And whosoever shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery."

The study of Eastern Orthodox history in this connection is valuable, not as representing a primitive tradition, nor as an example to be followed, but as a terrible lesson of what happens when men start (even with the best of intentions) to compromise the austere morality of the Gospel of Christ.

[Note. In all fairness, it should perhaps be mentioned that the Orthodox Church tolerates, rather than approves, second marriages, whether the first ended in death or divorce. The liturgical tone of service for those being married the first time is very joyful; the second, distinctly penitential—e. g. "give them the conversion of the publican, the tears of the harlot, the confession of the thief; that through repentance . . . they too may be counted worthy of Thy heavenly kingdom."]

DO THE FOUR FREEDOMS APPLY TO EPISCOPALIANS IN THE ARMED FORCES?

By the Editor.

THE recent Draft again raises the vital issue of the right of Episcopalians in the Armed Forces to practice their religion in accordance with the Church's teaching. More concretely it raises the question of the rights of the Chaplains to act as priests of the Church and not simply as agents of the United States Government, or as representatives of a nebulous pan-Protestantism, and the right of lay members of the Church to receive the Church's Sacraments and to practice her faith.

In the late war the right of Episcopalians to practice their religion was flagrantly violated in some branches of the Armed Forces, notably in the United States Navy. Thus at Hunter College, while Roman Catholic Waves were freely dismissed and allowed to go out of bounds to attend Mass when no Roman priest was available at the College, and while Jewish Waves were similarly allowed to go out of bounds to attend their Synagogue in the absence of a Jewish Chaplain, Episcopalian Waves were denied the right to go to their own Church to receive Holy Communion on the ground that there was a "Protestant Chaplain" at the College. It made no difference whether the Chaplain was a Methodist, a Baptist, a Pentecostal Nazarene or a twin-seed-in-the-spirit Pillar of Fire-rite: it was to him that Episcopalians must resort for such Sacraments or other spiritual ministrations as they desired.

At Camp Bainbridge in Maryland, while the Roman Catholics were allowed to announce their Services (as "Catholic Services"), and while the Jews and Christian Scientists were allowed the same privilege, no Services of the Episcopal Church might be announced as such. There was, as it happened, a Communion Service at 8 o'clock each Sunday celebrated by a priest of our Church, but this was listed under "Protestant Services" with no indication of its being a Service of the Episcopal Church. Many of our men were at Camp Bainbridge for many months without realizing that the Sacraments of the Church were available to them. This was pointed out to the Authorities at the Camp, but nothing was done about it. When it was pointed out to them that this was a violation of

the elementary rights of American citizens and of Christian Churchmen, they became first indignant, and then insulting.

When finally a group of priests under the Chairmanship of your present Editor appealed to Washington, they were given a copy of a Naval Regulation passed in March, 1944, which directed that members of any Church or denomination who could not conscientiously receive the Sacraments except at the hands of ministers or priests of their own Church should be allowed to do so wherever possible, and that such Services should be announced definitely as services of the Church in question. It was promised that this regulation—which apparently had become a dead letter in nearly all the Naval camps—would be called to the attention of the Authorities at Camp Bainbridge. However, many weeks went by and nothing was done about it. The attention of the Army and Navy Commission was drawn to the matter. They likewise apparently did nothing. It was not until an appeal was threatened to the Civil Courts that any action was taken, and that permission was given for the Services of the Episcopal Church to be announced as such at Camp Bainbridge.

This was not the end of the matter. The Commanding Officer now refused to allow the Episcopal Services to be held in the Chapel. Other religious bodies might use the Chapel for their Services, but not the Episcopalians. This was such a flagrant denial of elementary rights that the Episcopalian Chaplain there offered his resignation on the ground of denial of religious liberty. The Authorities apparently were not anxious to accept a resignation on such a ground, and finally backed down.

The whole affair—all too typical of Naval procedure during the late war—reveals the flagrant disregard of the religious rights and convictions of those classified as "Protestants" who hold the faith and the sacramental religion of the Church, whether Chaplains or lay men and women in the Armed Forces. It reveals also the ineffectiveness of the Army and Navy Commission as then constituted. Leading members of the Commission again and again insisted there were no violations of the rights of Episcopalians in the Armed Forces. This was even stated in the House of Bishops at the last General Convention.

It is to be hoped that the new Commission will prove more energetic. Also that General Convention will take some concrete steps to clear up the status, and to defend the rights—as Americans and as Churchmen—of our men and women in their country's service. It would be inexcusable, if in the next war, through our fault, men had to face death without the Church' Sacraments.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF GENERAL CONVENTION CLARIFYING THE RELIGIOUS RIGHTS & PRIVILEGES OF EPISCOPALIANS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(Suggested by a Chaplain.)

"BE it resolved that General Convention and The Army & Navy Division of The National Council take every reasonable step to investigate thoroughly every known or reported case of violation of the Rights of Episcopalians in the Armed Forces, and insist on such restitution as may be possible being made to the individuals concerned who by reason of loyalty to the Faith and Practice of the Church were penalized by the military.

Further, that the Secretary of Defense be advised, and necessary action be taken to see that the following information be disseminated to all Chaplains and all Commanding Officers: 1. Except in case of grave emergency, when no Episcopal clergyman is available, chaplain or civilian, Holy Baptism should not be administered to men for acceptance in and by the Episcopal Church, and that such should be followed by the 'reception formula' at the earliest possible convenience, in cases where this is administered by other than an Episcopal clergyman; 2. 'Membership in the Church' cannot be accepted except where such is completed and fulfilled by Confirmation (after Baptism) administered by a valid Bishop; or by a priest functioning under the authority of the same; 3. that the Church only recognizes the Sacrament of Holy Communion for her members when administered by a priest in valid orders; 4. No statement which might lead to a confusion of such an understanding, or be taken as an endorsement of this Church to substitute the Sacraments or Rites of any religious body for the normal practice of our Church should be made by service chaplains; 5. That Episcopalians be given the right to so classify themselves in religious census and on identification tags in the armed forces; 6. That the various articles of regulations for the various branches of service in the armed forces which guarantee a chaplain the right to refuse to perform any religious function which is contrary to the rules of his Church be enforced, particularly with regard to Episcopal Chaplains, and that adherence to such be never used as a pretext for the transfer or lack of assignment of any chaplain to any duty for which he is otherwise qualified; 7. That nothing except 'military emergency' of the most extreme kind be used to prevent any chaplain in the armed forces from making himself available to minister to members of his own faith to whom he may be adjacent."

THE MOVEMENT OF THE LITURGY (Concluded).

By the Editor.

IN the Administration of the Blessed Sacrament, there is again a reference to Calvary. "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee." "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee." But the Holy Eucharist is not only the Sacrament of our Lord's death. It is also the Sacrament of His life. It is no less closely connected with the Garden of the Resurrection than with Calvary. Accordingly the priest prays, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee preserve thy Body and soul unto everlasting life;" "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Our Anglican reformers, in adding this phrase to the Sentence of Administration, brought back the emphasis of the early Church on the effect of the Blessed Sacrament on our bodies as well as our souls. "The Eucharist," as St. Ignatius, the martyr Bishop of Antioch wrote about the year 115 A. D., "is the medicine of immortality and the antidote against death."

Our Lord Himself, in the Sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel, connects the Holy Eucharist with the Resurrection. "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever . . . whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." To those who rightly appreciate what the Holy Eucharist is and what intimate union with our Lord is made possible by this Sacrament, the joy of the Resurrection is no passing sentiment. Rather it is Easter all the year.

The sacrifice which reconciles God and man, heaven and earth, was offered on Good Friday. It was finished, complete. Easter shows that the sacrifice has been accepted, that God has received the dedicated life of His Son, the obedience of His Son, (an obedience which went all the way to the Cross,) the love of His Son for God and man, the reparation of His Son for us, and has accepted these as a perfect atonement for the sins of the whole world.

In the Jewish sacrifices, offered under the Old Covenant, it was understood that the life of the Victim was not so much destroyed as surrendered to God. It lived on with God and the worshippers partook of that life. In a far deeper and higher sense that is true of our Lord, the true Passover Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world. His life was surrendered to the Father, and now that He has risen triumphantly from the dead, the Victor over sin and death, His life is available for us. In the Holy Eucharist, which is both a sacrament and a sacrifice, we come to feed upon the heavenly Resurrection Body of our Lord. The life that He gave for us on the Cross He gives to us in this wonderful sacrament, and as we

feed upon His once sacrificed Body and Blood, we are united to His sacrifice. We receive the benefits of His death; we share in His risen Life.

As we receive the Body and Blood of the risen Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, we receive the seed of our own resurrection. The risen Body in a sense may be said to grow up within our present body, through our sacramental union with Jesus Christ. Even now we may live with Him, and reign with Him. Even now, while we dwell below, we may lift up our hearts to Heaven above, to the Lord Who comes to us in the Holy Eucharist, to exalt us in the power of His risen Life. And when Christ Who is our life shall be manifested, then we too shall be manifested with Him in glory.

In administering the Blessed Sacrament, our Church follows the plain teaching of our Lord and the example of the Early Church in directing the priest to communicate the faithful in both kinds. The blessings and graces given through the Sacraments are conditioned upon our obedience. Our Lord commanded the Apostles, "All of you drink of it," as He gave them the Chalice of His Precious Blood. Consequently those who deprive the faithful of the Chalice entirely are violating our Lord's plain command and are robbing them, if not of a valid Sacrament, at least of the particular grace and blessing attached to the Cup, that is to say, the grace of gladness. Even worse is the form of intinction, which is practiced by some lawless individuals in our own Church. This amounts to "dunking" a practice ordinarily associated only with hoodlums in taking food, and is especially inappropriate when connected with the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. An elementary sense of reverence and regard to the plain language of the Prayer Book should exclude any such abominable practices.

The first sentence of Administration, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ—the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc.,"—indicates what the Blessed Sacrament is. The second sentence indicates the nature of our response. Each one is to take and eat this (the Body of Christ) in remembrance that the Saviour died for him in particular, and he is to feed on Christ in his heart by faith with thanksgiving. It is not enough that we receive our food. It is also necessary that we digest and assimilate it. This applies to our spiritual food, the Body and Blood of Christ, no less than to the food of our bodies. Only by faith can we assimilate the wondrous gift which we have received in this Sacrament, or rather be assimilated to Him Whom we have received. Ordinary food is converted into the substance of our own bodies. But the Holy Eucharist, as St. Leo reminds us, is entirely different. We are not to change it into ourselves, but rather we are to be changed into Christ. We are to be conformed

to His image and likeness. For this purpose it is not only necessary that we should receive Him in Holy Communion, but also that we should constantly feed on Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

Ordinarily the layman need give little or no attention to the Rubrics of the Prayer Book. But the Rubrics on page 83 are worthy of careful notice. One of them directs that, "If the consecrated bread or wine be spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more, according to the form already prescribed; beginning at, All glory be to thee, Almighty God, and ending with these words, partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." This Rubric furnishes clear proof that the Church does not guarantee that the Sacrament is consecrated by the mere recitation by the priest of our Lord's words, "This is my Body, etc." Rather it is only after the blessing by God's Word and Holy Spirit that we are assured that the consecration is complete, and that the holy Gifts are truly our Lord's most blessed Body and Blood.

The next Rubric orders the priest to cover the consecrated Elements reverently with a fair linen cloth, that is the pall or corporal, so-called because it covers the Body (Corpus) of our Saviour. This is a further indication of the Church's belief in the Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in this Sacrament, a Presence which continues after Communion no less than before. Otherwise there would be no point in treating the consecrated Elements with such reverence and devotion.

However, the place where we are most concerned to seek the Presence of our Lord after Communion is not in the sacramental Elements—true and precious as that is—but in our own souls. We may make our own the thought of blessed Richard Hooker, "Why should any other thought possess the mind of the devout communicant than this, 'O my God thou art true! O my soul thou art happy!'"

After a banquet we give thinks to the host. To fail to do so would be to show ourselves lacking in elementary good manners, to say nothing of gratitude. Therefore, after partaking of the Sacred Banquet which God spreads for His children, where Christ is both "the Master of the Feast and the Feast itself," we give hearty thanks to God for the greatest privilege which we can receive in this life, the privilege of partaking of the spiritual food of the precious Body and Blood of our Lord. Normally we should remain after the service to give thanks to God for the wondrous gift we have received. Or if we cannot do so, then we should try to make it up in the course of the day, by lifting our hearts in thanksgiving to God again and again. The Church sees to it that we make at least a little thanksgiving while we are still there.

As we ponder the meaning of the gift, we necessarily think of the marvelous favor and goodness God has shown us in giving His only Son,

not only to die for us upon the Cross, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in this most holy Sacrament. We thank Him for this too. We thank Him for the assurance that we are very members in corporate in the Mystical Body of His Son. "Seeing that the bread is one, we the many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." We cannot be members of Christ without being members of His Body, the Church, and therefore members one of another. There is a vertical relationship and also a horizontal relationship in the Christian life. The two go together. The union with Christ in His Church, which began with Holy Baptism, is nourished and deepened with each good Communion. And so is our union with one another, with all the members of the Body of Christ, as we share together in the bread which is Christ's Body and the wine which is His Blood.

But this fellowship, though it begins on earth, can reach its full perfection only in the world to come. And so we give thanks to God for the assurance, through this holy Sacrament, that we are heirs of His everlasting Kingdom. All of these gifts and blessings come to us through the merits of the most precious Death and Passion of Christ, which we lovingly commemorate and plead and present to God in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Next we implore the grace of God to enable us to live worthily of the life and fellowship to which He has called us, to do all such good works as He has prepared us to walk in.

After the Prayer of Thanksgiving we say or sing the Gloria in Excelsis. With good reason does this magnificent hymn come at the end of the Communion Service in our Liturgy, for "never are we so fit to sing the Song of the Angels as when we have the Lord of the Angels dwelling in our hearts through the Eucharistic Gift." "The Angels sang this song at Bethlehem in thanksgiving for Christ being made one of us. With even greater reason do we sing it at this time in thanksgiving for Christ being made one with us."

The Service concludes with the blessing, perhaps the most beautiful Eucharistic blessing in Christendom. As the priest turns to say it, we should think of our risen Lord, just before His Ascension, lifting up His hands and blessing the Disciples. He withdraws from earthly sight, yet He promises to abide with them evermore. The sacramental Presence comes to an end with the consumption of the sacred Elements, but our Lord wills to abide in our souls and in the fellowship of His Church for ever.

> "The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: And the Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. Amen."

AN ANGLICAN SOCIETY DIRECTORY

Honorary President: *The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, D. D.*
68 South Swan St.,
Albany 6, N. Y.

President: *The Very Rev. Edward R. Welles*
St. Paul's Cathedral,
Buffalo 2, N. Y.

Vice President: *The Rev. J. Wilson Sutton, D. D.*
1 West 72nd St.,
New York, N. Y.

Secretary: *The Rev. Charles E. Hill*
Twin Oaks,
Williamstown, Mass.

Treasurer: *Mr. William Lackman*
Livingston, Columbia Co., N. Y.

Chairman Extension Committee: *The Rev. George Grambs*
141 Broadway,
Bayonne, N. J.

West Coast Representative: *The Rev. Merrill A. Norton*
Barstow, California.

Southern Representative: *The Rev. Louis O. V. Thomas*
305 South Commerce St.,
Natchez, Mississippi.

Editor, THE ANGLICAN, *The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D.*
St. Mark's Church,
1625 Locust St.,
Philadelphia, Pa.